13 Robot Motion Planning

Getting Where You Want to Be

One of the ultimate goals in robotics is to design autonomous robots: robots that you can tell what to do without having to say how to do it. Among other things, this means a robot has to be able to plan its own motion.

To be able to plan a motion, a robot must have some knowledge about the environment in which it is moving. For example, a mobile robot moving around in a factory must know where obstacles are located. Some of this information—where walls and machines are located—can be provided by a floor plan. For other information the robot will have to rely on its sensors. It should be able to detect obstacles that are not on the floor plan—people, for instance. Using the information about the environment, the robot has to move to its goal position without colliding with any of the obstacles.

This motion planning problem has to be solved whenever any kind of robot wants to move in physical space. The description above assumed that we have an autonomous robot moving around in some factory environment. That kind of robot is still quite rare compared to the robot arms that are now widely employed in industry.

A robot arm, or articulated robot, consists of a number of links, connected by joints. Normally, one end of the arm—its base—is firmly connected to the ground, while the other end carries a hand or some kind of tool. The number of links varies between three to six or even more. The joints are usually of two types, the revolute joint type that allows the links to rotate around the joint, much like an elbow, or the prismatic joint type that allows one of the links to slide in and out. Robot arms are mostly used to assemble or manipulate parts of an object, or to perform tasks like welding or spraying. To do this, they must be able to move from one position to another, without colliding with the environment, the object they are operating on, or—an interesting complication—with themselves.

In this chapter we introduce some of the basic notions and techniques used in motion planning. The general motion planning problem is quite difficult, and we shall make some simplifying assumptions.

The most drastic simplification is that we will look at a 2-dimensional mo-
tion planning problem. The environment will be a planar region with polygonal obstacles, and the robot itself will also be polygonal. We also assume that the environment is static—there are no people walking in the way of our robot—and known to the robot. The restriction to planar robots is not as severe as it appears at first sight: for a robot moving around on a work floor, a floor plan showing the location of walls, tables, machines, and so on, is often sufficient to plan a motion.

The types of motions a robot can execute depend on its mechanics. Some robots can move in any direction, while others are constrained in their motions. Car-like robots, for instance, cannot move sideways—otherwise parallel parking would be less challenging. In addition, they often have a certain minimum turning radius. The geometry of the motions of car-like robots is quite complicated, so we will restrict ourselves to robots that can move in arbitrary directions. In fact, we will mainly look at robots that can translate only; at the end of the chapter we'll briefly consider the case of robots that can also change their orientation by rotation.

### 13.1 Work Space and Configuration Space

Let \( \mathcal{R} \) be a robot moving around in a 2-dimensional environment, or work space, consisting of a set \( S = \{ \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_t \} \) of obstacles. We assume that \( \mathcal{R} \) is a simple polygon. A placement, or configuration, of the robot can now be specified by a translation vector. We denote the robot translated over a vector \((x, y)\) by \( \mathcal{R}(x, y) \). For instance, if the robot is the polygon with vertices \((1, -1), (1, 1), (0, 3), (-1, 1), \) and \((-1, -1)\), then the vertices of \( \mathcal{R}(6, 4) \) are \((7, 3), (7, 5), (6, 7), (5, 5), \) and \((5, 3)\). With this notation, a robot can be specified by listing the vertices of \( \mathcal{R}(0, 0) \).

An alternative way to view this is in terms of a reference point. This is most intuitive if the origin \((0, 0)\) lies in the interior of \( \mathcal{R}(0, 0) \). By definition, this point is then called the reference point of the robot. We can specify a placement of \( \mathcal{R} \) by simply stating the coordinates of the reference point if the robot is in the given placement. Thus \( \mathcal{R}(x, y) \) specifies that the robot is placed with its reference point at \((x, y)\). In general, the reference point does not have to be inside the robot; it can also be a point outside the robot, which we might imagine to be attached to the robot by an invisible stick. By definition, this point is at origin for \( \mathcal{R}(0, 0) \).

Now suppose the robot can change its orientation by rotation, say around its reference point. We then need an extra parameter, \( \phi \), to specify the orientation of the robot. We let \( \mathcal{R}(x, y, \phi) \) denote the robot with its reference point at \((x, y)\) and rotated through an angle \( \phi \). So what is specified initially is \( \mathcal{R}(0, 0, 0) \).

In general, a placement of a robot is specified by a number of parameters that corresponds to the number of degrees of freedom (DOF) of the robot. This number is two for planar robots that can only translate, and it is three for planar robots that can rotate as well as translate. The number of parameters we need...
for a robot in 3-dimensional space is higher, of course: a translating robot in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) has three degrees of freedom, and a robot that is free to translate and rotate in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) has six degrees of freedom.

The parameter space of a robot \( \mathcal{R} \) is usually called its configuration space. It is denoted by \( C(\mathcal{R}) \). A point \( p \) in this configuration space corresponds to a certain placement \( \mathcal{R}(p) \) of the robot in the work space.

In the example of a translating and rotating robot in the plane the configuration space is 3-dimensional. A point \( (x, y, \phi) \) in this space corresponds to the placement \( \mathcal{R}(x, y, \phi) \) in the work space. The configuration space is not the Euclidean 3-dimensional space; it is the space \( \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0 : 360] \). Because rotations over zero and 360 degrees are equivalent, the configuration space of a rotating robot has a special topology, which is like a cylinder.

The configuration space of a translating robot in the plane is the 2-dimensional Euclidean plane, and therefore identical to the work space. Still, it is useful to distinguish the two notions: the work space is the space where the robot actually moves around—the real world, so to speak—and the configuration space is the parameter space of the robot. A polygonal robot in the work space is represented by a point in configuration space, and any point in configuration space corresponds to some placement of an actual robot in work space.

We now have a way to specify a placement of the robot, namely by specifying values for the parameters determining the placement or, in other words, by specifying a point in configuration space. But clearly not all points in configuration space are possible; points corresponding to placements where the robot intersects one of the obstacles in \( \mathcal{S} \) are forbidden. We call the part of the configuration space consisting of these points the forbidden configuration space, or forbidden space for short. It is denoted by \( C_{\text{forb}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) \). The rest of the configuration space, which consists of the points corresponding to free placements—placements where the robot does not intersect any obstacle—is called the free configuration space, or free space, and it is denoted by \( C_{\text{free}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) \).

A path for the robot maps to a curve in the configuration space, and vice versa: every placement along the path simply maps to the corresponding point in configuration space. A collision-free path maps to a curve in the free space. Figure 13.1 illustrates this for a translating planar robot. On the left the work space is shown, with a collision-free path from the initial position to the goal position of the robot. On the right the configuration space is shown, with the grey area indicating the forbidden part of it. The unshaded area in between the grey area is the free space. For clarity, the obstacles are still shown in the configuration space, although they have no meaning there. The curve corresponding to the collision-free path is also shown.

We have seen how to map placements of the robot to points in the configuration space, and paths of the robot to curves in that space. Can we also map obstacles to configuration space? The answer is yes: an obstacle \( \mathcal{P} \) is mapped to the set of points \( p \) in configuration space such that \( \mathcal{R}(p) \) intersects \( \mathcal{P} \). The resulting set is called the configuration-space obstacle, or \( C \)-obstacle for short, of \( \mathcal{P} \).
Figure 13.1
A path in the work space and the corresponding curve in the configuration space.

$C$-obstacles may overlap even when the obstacles in the work space are disjoint. This happens when there are placements of the robot where it intersects more than one obstacle at the same time.

There is one subtle issue that we have ignored so far: does the robot collide with an obstacle when it touches that obstacle? In other words, do we define the obstacles to be topologically open or closed sets? In the remainder we will choose the first option: obstacles are open sets, so that the robot is allowed to touch them. This is of little importance in this chapter, but it will become useful in Chapter 15. In practice a movement where the robot passes very close to an obstacle cannot be considered safe because of possible errors in robot control. Such movements can be avoided by slightly enlarging all the obstacles before the computation of a path.

## 13.2 A Point Robot

Before we try to plan the motion of a polygonal robot in the plane, let’s have a look at point robots. Given the mapping from work space to configuration space that we saw in the previous section this is not such a strange idea. Furthermore, it’s always good to start with a simple case. As before, we denote the robot by $R$, and we denote the obstacles by $P_1, \ldots, P_l$. The obstacles are polygons with disjoint interiors, whose total number of vertices is denoted by $n$. For a point robot, the work space and the configuration space are identical. (That is to say, if we make the natural assumption that its reference point is the point robot itself. Otherwise the configuration space is a translated copy of the work space.)

Rather than finding a path from a particular start position to a particular goal position we will construct a data structure storing a representation of the free space. This data structure can then be used to compute a path between any two given start and goal positions. Such an approach is useful if the work space of the robot does not change and many paths have to be computed.

To simplify the description we restrict the motion of the robot to a large bound-
ing box $B$ that contains the set of polygons. In other words, we add one extra infinitely large obstacle, which is the area outside $B$. The free configuration space $C_{\text{free}}$ now consists of the part of $B$ not covered by any obstacle:

$$C_{\text{free}} = B \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{t} P_i.$$ 

The free space is a possibly disconnected region, which may have holes. Our goal is to compute a representation of the free space that allows us to find a path for any start and goal position. We will use the trapezoidal map for this. Recall from Chapter 6 that the trapezoidal map of a set of non-intersecting line segments inside a bounding box is obtained by drawing two vertical extensions from every segment endpoint, one going upward until a segment (or the bounding box) is hit, and one going downward until a segment (or the bounding box) is hit. In Chapter 6 we developed a randomized algorithm, TRAPEZOIDALMAP, that computes the trapezoidal map of a set of $n$ segments in $O(n \log n)$ expected time. The following algorithm, which computes a representation of the free space, uses this algorithm as a subroutine.

**Algorithm** COMPUTEFREESPACE($S$)  
*Input.* A set $S$ of disjoint polygons.  
*Output.* A trapezoidal map of $C_{\text{free}}(\mathcal{R},S)$ for a point robot $\mathcal{R}$.  
1. Let $E$ be the set of edges of the polygons in $S$.  
2. Compute the trapezoidal map $T(E)$ with algorithm TRAPEZOIDALMAP described in Chapter 6.  
3. Remove the trapezoids that lie inside one of the polygons from $T(E)$ and return the resulting subdivision.

The algorithm is illustrated in Figure 13.2. Part (a) of the figure shows the trapezoidal map of the obstacle edges inside the bounding box; this is what is computed in line 2 of the algorithm. Part (b) shows the map after the trapezoids inside the obstacles have been removed in line 3.

There is one detail left: how do we find the trapezoids inside the obstacles, which have to be removed? This is not so difficult, because after running TRAPEZOIDALMAP we know for each trapezoid the edge that bounds it from the top, and we known to which obstacle that edge belongs. To decide whether or not to remove the trapezoid, it suffices to check whether the edge bounds the obstacle from above or from below. The latter test takes only constant time,
because the edges of the obstacles are listed in order along the boundary so that the obstacle lies to a specific, known side of the edges.

The expected time taken by TRAPEZOIDALMAP is $O(n \log n)$, so we get the following result.

**Lemma 13.1** A trapezoidal map of the free configuration space for a point robot moving among a set of disjoint polygonal obstacles with $n$ edges in total can be computed by a randomized algorithm in $O(n \log n)$ expected time.

In what follows, we will denote the trapezoidal map of the free space by $T(C_{\text{free}})$.

How do we use $T(C_{\text{free}})$ to find a path from a start position $p_{\text{start}}$ to a goal position $p_{\text{goal}}$?

If $p_{\text{start}}$ and $p_{\text{goal}}$ are in the same trapezoid of the map, this is easy: the robot can simply move to its goal in a straight line.

If the start and goal position are in different trapezoids, however, then things are not so easy. In this case the path will cross a number of trapezoids and it may have to make turns in some of them. To guide the motion across trapezoids we construct a road map through the free space. The road map is a graph $G_{\text{road}}$, which is embedded in the plane. More precisely, it is embedded in the free space. Except for an initial and final portion, paths will always follow the road map. Notice that any two neighboring trapezoids share a vertical edge that is a vertical extension of a segment endpoint. This leads us to define the road map as follows. We place one node in the center of each trapezoid, and we place one node in the middle of each vertical extension. There is an arc between two nodes if and only if one node is in the center of a trapezoid and the other node is on the boundary of that same trapezoid. The arcs are embedded in the plane as straight line segments, so following an arc in the road map corresponds to a straight-line motion of the robot. Figure 13.3 illustrates this. The road map $G_{\text{road}}$ can be constructed in $O(n)$ time by traversing the doubly-connected edge list of $T(C_{\text{free}})$. Using the arcs in the road map we can go from the node in the center of one trapezoid to the node in the center of a neighboring trapezoid via the node on their common boundary.
We can use the road map, together with the trapezoidal map, to plan a motion from a start to a goal position. To this end we first determine the trapezoids $\Delta_{\text{start}}$ and $\Delta_{\text{goal}}$ containing these points. If they are the same trapezoid, then we move from $p_{\text{start}}$ to $p_{\text{goal}}$ in a straight line. Otherwise, let $v_{\text{start}}$ and $v_{\text{goal}}$ be the nodes of $G_{\text{road}}$ that have been placed in the center of these trapezoids. The path from $p_{\text{start}}$ to $p_{\text{goal}}$ that we will construct now consists of three parts: the first part is a straight-line motion from $p_{\text{start}}$ to $v_{\text{start}}$, the second part is a path from $v_{\text{start}}$ to $v_{\text{goal}}$ along the arcs of the road map, and the final part is a straight-line motion from $v_{\text{goal}}$ to $p_{\text{goal}}$. Figure 13.4 illustrates this.
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Figure 13.4
A path computed from the road map of Figure 13.3

The following algorithm summarizes how a path is found.

**Algorithm** `COMPUTE_PATH(T(C_{\text{free}}), G_{\text{road}}, p_{\text{start}}, p_{\text{goal}})`

**Input.** The trapezoidal map $T(C_{\text{free}})$ of the free space, the road map $G_{\text{road}}$, a start position $p_{\text{start}}$, and goal position $p_{\text{goal}}$.

**Output.** A path from $p_{\text{start}}$ to $p_{\text{goal}}$ if it exists. If a path does not exist, this fact is reported.

1. Find the trapezoid $\Delta_{\text{start}}$ containing $p_{\text{start}}$ and the trapezoid $\Delta_{\text{goal}}$ containing $p_{\text{goal}}$.
2. **if** $\Delta_{\text{start}}$ or $\Delta_{\text{goal}}$ does not exist
3. **then** Report that the start or goal position is in the forbidden space.
4. **else** Let $v_{\text{start}}$ be the node of $G_{\text{road}}$ in the center of $\Delta_{\text{start}}$.
5. Let $v_{\text{goal}}$ be the node of $G_{\text{road}}$ in the center of $\Delta_{\text{goal}}$.
6. Compute a path in $G_{\text{road}}$ from $v_{\text{start}}$ to $v_{\text{goal}}$ using breadth-first search.
7. **if** there is no such path
8. **then** Report that there is no path from $p_{\text{start}}$ to $p_{\text{goal}}$.
9. **else** Report the path consisting of a straight-line motion from $p_{\text{start}}$ to $v_{\text{start}}$, the path found in $G_{\text{road}}$, and a straight-line motion from $v_{\text{goal}}$ to $p_{\text{goal}}$.

Before we analyze the time complexity of algorithm, let's think about its correctness. Are the paths we report always collision-free, and do we always find a collision-free path if one exists?
The first question is easy to answer: any path we report must be collision-free, since it consists of segments inside trapezoids and all trapezoids are in the free space.

To answer the second question, suppose that there is a collision-free path from \( P_{\text{start}} \) to \( P_{\text{goal}} \). Obviously \( P_{\text{start}} \) and \( P_{\text{goal}} \) must lie in one of the trapezoids covering the free space, so it remains to show that there is a path in \( G_{\text{road}} \) from \( v_{\text{start}} \) to \( v_{\text{goal}} \). The path from \( P_{\text{start}} \) to \( P_{\text{goal}} \) must cross a sequence of trapezoids. Denote the sequence of trapezoids by \( \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \ldots, \Delta_k \). By definition, \( \Delta_1 = \Delta_{\text{start}} \) and \( \Delta_k = \Delta_{\text{goal}} \). Let \( v_i \) be the node of \( G_{\text{road}} \) that is in the center of \( \Delta_i \). If the path goes from \( \Delta_i \) to \( \Delta_{i+1} \), then \( \Delta_i \) and \( \Delta_{i+1} \) must be neighbors, so they share a vertical extension. But \( G_{\text{road}} \) is constructed such that the nodes of such trapezoids are connected through the node on their common boundary. Hence, there is a path (consisting of two arcs) in \( G_{\text{road}} \) from \( v_i \) to \( v_{i+1} \). This means that there is a path from \( v_1 \) to \( v_k \) as well. It follows that the breadth-first search in \( G_{\text{road}} \) will find some (possibly different) path from \( v_{\text{start}} \) to \( v_{\text{goal}} \).

We now analyze the time the algorithm takes.

Finding the trapezoids containing the start and goal can be done in \( O(\log n) \) using the point location structure of Chapter 6. Alternatively, we can simply check all trapezoids in linear time; we shall see that the rest of the algorithm takes linear time anyway, so this does not increase the time bound asymptotically.

The breadth-first search takes linear time in the size of the graph \( G_{\text{road}} \). This graph has one node per trapezoid plus one node per vertical extension. Both the number of vertical extensions and the number of trapezoids are linear in the total number of vertices of the obstacles. The number of arcs in the graph is linear as well, because it is planar. Hence, the breadth-first search takes \( O(n) \) time.

The time to report the path is bounded by the maximum number of arcs on a path in \( G_{\text{road}} \), which is \( O(n) \).

We get the following theorem.

**Theorem 13.2** Let \( R \) be a point robot moving among a set \( S \) of polygonal obstacles with \( n \) edges in total. We can preprocess \( S \) in \( O(n \log n) \) expected time, such that between any start and goal position a collision-free path for \( R \) can be computed in \( O(n) \) time, if it exists.

The path computed by the algorithm of this section is collision-free, but we can give no guarantee that the path does not make large detours. In Chapter 15 we will develop an algorithm that actually computes the shortest possible path. That algorithm, however, will be slower by an order of magnitude.

### 13.3 Minkowski Sums

In the previous section we solved the motion planning problem for a point robot; we computed a trapezoidal map of its free space and used that map to
plan its motions. The same approach can be used if the robot is a polygon. There is one difference that makes dealing with a polygonal robot more difficult: the configuration-space obstacles are no longer the same as the obstacles in work space. Therefore we start by studying the free configuration space of a translating polygonal robot. In the next section we will then describe how to compute it, so that we can use it to plan the motion of the robot.

We assume that the robot $R$ is convex, and for the moment we also assume that the obstacles are convex. Recall that we use $R(x, y)$ to denote the placement of $R$ with its reference point at $(x, y)$. The configuration-space obstacle, or C-obstacle, of an obstacle $\mathcal{P}$ and the robot $R$ is defined as the set of points in configuration space such that the corresponding placement of $R$ intersects $\mathcal{P}$. So if we denote the C-obstacle of $\mathcal{P}$ by $C\mathcal{P}$, then we have

$$C\mathcal{P} := \{(x, y) : R(x, y) \cap \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset\}.$$ 

You can visualize the shape of $C\mathcal{P}$ by sliding $R$ along the boundary of $\mathcal{P}$; the curve traced by the reference point of $R$ is the boundary of $C\mathcal{P}$.

We can describe this in a different way using the notion of Minkowski sums. The Minkowski sum of two sets $S_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, denoted by $S_1 \oplus S_2$, is defined as

$$S_1 \oplus S_2 := \{p + q : p \in S_1, q \in S_2\},$$

where $p + q$ denotes the vector sums of the vectors $p$ and $q$, that is, if $p = (p_x, p_y)$ and $q = (q_x, q_y)$ then we have

$$p + q := (p_x + q_x, p_y + q_y).$$

Because a polygon is a planar set the definition of Minkowski sums also applies to them.

To be able to express the C-obstacles as Minkowski sums, we need one more piece of notation. For a point $p = (p_x, p_y)$ we define $-p := (-p_x, -p_y)$, and for a set $S$ we define $-S := \{-p : p \in S\}$. In other words, we get $-S$ by reflecting $S$ about the origin. We now have the following theorem.

**Theorem 13.3** Let $R$ be a planar, translating robot and let $\mathcal{P}$ be an obstacle. Then the C-obstacle of $\mathcal{P}$ is $\mathcal{P} \oplus (-R(0, 0))$.

**Proof.** We have to prove that $R(x, y)$ intersects $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if we have that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{P} \oplus (-R(0, 0))$.

First, suppose that $R(x, y)$ intersects $\mathcal{P}$, and let $q = (q_x, q_y)$ be a point in the intersection. It follows from $q \in R(x, y)$ that we have $(q_x - x, q_y - y) \in R(0, 0)$ or, equivalently, that $(-q_x + x, -q_y + y) \in -R(0, 0)$. Because we also have $q \in \mathcal{P}$, this implies that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{P} \oplus (-R(0, 0))$.

Conversely, let $(x, y) \in \mathcal{P} \oplus (-R(0, 0))$. Then there are points $(r_x, r_y) \in R(0, 0)$ and $(p_x, p_y) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $(x, y) = (p_x - r_x, p_y - r_y)$ or, in other words, such that $p_x = r_x + x$ and $p_y = r_y + y$, which implies that $R(x, y)$ intersects $\mathcal{P}$. $\square$
So for a planar translating robot $R$, the $C$-obstacles are the Minkowski sums of the obstacles and $-R(0,0)$. (Sometimes $P \oplus (-R(0,0))$ is referred to as the Minkowski difference of $P$ and $R(0,0)$. Since Minkowski differences are defined differently in the mathematics literature we shall avoid this term.)

In the remainder of this section we will derive some useful properties of Minkowski sums and develop an algorithm to compute them.

We start with a simple observation about extreme points on Minkowski sums.

**Observation 13.4** Let $P$ and $R$ be two objects on the plane, and let $CP := P \oplus R$. An extreme point in direction $\vec{d}$ on $CP$ is the sum of extreme points in direction $\vec{d}$ on $P$ and $R$.

Figure 13.5 illustrates the observation. Using this observation we now prove that the Minkowski sum of two convex polygons has linear complexity.

**Theorem 13.5** Let $P$ and $R$ be two convex polygons with $n$ and $m$ edges, respectively. Then the Minkowski sum $P \oplus R$ is a convex polygon with at most $n + m$ edges.

**Proof.** The convexity of the Minkowski sum of two convex sets follows directly from the definition.

To see that the complexity of the Minkowski sum is linear, consider an edge $e$ of $P \oplus R$. This edge is extreme in the direction of its outer normal. Hence, it must be generated by points on $P$ and $R$ that are extreme in the same direction. Moreover, at least one of $P$ and $R$ must have an edge that is extreme in that direction. We charge $e$ to this edge. This way each edge is charged at most once, so the total number of edges is at most $n + m$. (If $P$ and $R$ don’t have parallel edges, then the number of edges of the Minkowski sum is exactly $n + m$.)

So the Minkowski sum of two convex polygons is convex and has linear complexity. But there is more: the boundaries of two Minkowski sums can only intersect in a very special manner. To make this precise, we need one more piece of terminology.

We call a pair $a_1, a_2$ of planar objects a pair of *pseudodiscs* if it satisfies the *pseudodisc property*: the sets $a_1 \setminus a_2$ and $a_2 \setminus a_1$ are connected.
Figure 13.6 illustrates this definition. A collection of objects is called a collection of pseudodiscs if every pair of objects is a pair of pseudodiscs. Notice that any collection of discs forms a collection of pseudodiscs. Also a collection of axis-parallel squares is a collection of pseudodiscs.

![Pseudodiscs and not pseudodiscs](image)

Define a proper intersection of two curves to be an intersection consisting of a single point that is not a point where the curves touch. The boundaries of pseudodiscs have the following important property.

**Observation 13.6** For any pair of pseudodiscs there are at most two proper intersections between the boundaries.

Below we will prove that a collection of Minkowski sums forms a collection of pseudodiscs. But first we need one more observation about directions and extreme points on pairs of convex polygons with disjoint interiors. We will say that one polygon is more extreme in a direction $\vec{d}$ than another polygon if its extreme points lie further in that direction than the extreme points of the other polygon. For instance, a polygon is more extreme in the positive $x$-direction if its rightmost points lie to the right of the rightmost points of the other polygon.

We will look at extreme points for various directions. To this end we model the set of all directions by the unit circle centered at the origin: a point $p$ on the unit circle represents the direction given by the vector from the origin to $p$. The range from a direction $\vec{d}_1$ to a direction $\vec{d}_2$ is defined as the the directions corresponding to points in the counter-clockwise circle segment from the point representing $\vec{d}_1$ to the point representing $\vec{d}_2$. Note that the range from $\vec{d}_1$ to $\vec{d}_2$ is not the same as the range from $\vec{d}_2$ to $\vec{d}_1$. The following observation is illustrated in Figure 13.7.

![Directions between $\vec{d}_1$ and $\vec{d}_2$](image)

**Observation 13.7** Let $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ be convex polygons with disjoint interiors. Let $\vec{d}_1$ and $\vec{d}_2$ be directions in which $\mathcal{P}_1$ is more extreme than $\mathcal{P}_2$. Then either $\mathcal{P}_1$ is more extreme than $\mathcal{P}_2$ in all directions in the range from $\vec{d}_1$ to $\vec{d}_2$, or it is more extreme in all directions in the range from $\vec{d}_2$ to $\vec{d}_1$.  
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We are now ready to prove that Minkowski sums are pseudodiscs.

**Theorem 13.8** Let $P_1$ and $P_2$ be two convex polygons with disjoint interiors, and let $R$ be another convex polygon. Then the two Minkowski sums $P_1 \oplus R$ and $P_2 \oplus R$ are pseudodiscs.

**Proof.** Define $CP_1 := P_1 \oplus R$ and $CP_2 := P_2 \oplus R$. By symmetry, it suffices to show that $CP_1 \setminus CP_2$ is connected.

Since $CP_1$ and $CP_2$ are both convex, a connected component of $CP_1 \setminus CP_2$ must contain a point on the convex hull of $CP_1 \cup CP_2$. If there is more than one connected component, that means that there must be two directions $\vec{d}_1$ and $\vec{d}_2$ such that $CP_1$ is more extreme in those directions than $CP_2$. From Observation 13.4 it follows that $P_1$ is more extreme than $P_2$ in those two directions. By Observation 13.7 this means that either $P_1$ is more extreme than $P_2$ for all directions in the range from $\vec{d}_1$ to $\vec{d}_2$, or for all directions in the range from $\vec{d}_2$ to $\vec{d}_1$. Applying Observation 13.4 once more we conclude that the same holds for $CP_1$ with respect to $CP_2$. In other words, the set of directions for which the extreme points on $CP_1$ lie further out than those on $CP_2$ is connected, a contradiction to the assumption that there are two connected components. $\square$

This result is useful in combination with the following theorem.

**Theorem 13.9** Let $S$ be a collection of polygonal pseudodiscs with $n$ edges in total. Then the complexity of their union is $O(n)$.

**Proof.** We prove this by charging every vertex of the union to a pseudodisc vertex in such a way that any pseudodisc vertex is charged at most two times. This leads to a bound of $2n$ on the maximal complexity of the union.

The charging is done as follows. There are two types of vertices in the union boundary: pseudodisc vertices and intersections of pseudodisc edges.

Vertices of the former type are simply charged to themselves.

The charging for intersection points is a little more difficult. Consider a vertex $v$ of the union that is the intersection of an edge $e$ of a pseudodisc $P \in S$ and an edge $e'$ of a pseudodisc $P' \in S$. Imagine that these edges are directed such that they enter the interior of the other pseudodisc at $v$. Follow the edge $e$ into the interior of $P$. If it ends in the interior, then we charge $v$ to the endpoint of $e$ in the interior of $P$. Otherwise $e$ leaves the interior. The point where this happens is an intersection point of the boundaries of $P$ and $P'$. Together with $v$ this makes two intersection points, so that $e'$ cannot leave the interior of $P$ without violating the pseudodisc property. Hence, $e'$ has a vertex inside $P$, and we charge $v$ to this vertex.

If we do the charging in this way, then every pseudodisc vertex is charged at most twice. For vertices that are on the union boundary this is obvious: they only get charged by themselves. For the other vertices this can be seen as follows. From such a vertex, follow its incident edges until the union boundary is reached at an intersection point with some other edge; these two intersection points, if they exist, are the only ones that get charged to the vertex. $\square$
The proof of this theorem depends heavily on the pseudodiscs being polygonal, but the theorem itself generalizes to arbitrary pseudodiscs: the complexity of the union of any set of pseudodiscs is linear in the total complexity of the pseudodiscs. This implies for instance that the union of \( n \) discs in the plane has \( O(n) \) complexity. This more general theorem is a lot more difficult to prove.

Before we return to our motion planning application, we will give an algorithm to compute the Minkowski sum of two convex polygons \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{R} \). A very simple algorithm is the following. For each pair \( v, w \) of vertices, with \( v \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( w \in \mathcal{R} \), compute \( v + w \). Next, compute the convex hull of all these sums. Although the algorithm is very simple, it is inefficient when the polygons have a lot of vertices, because it looks at every pair of vertices. Below we give an alternative algorithm, which is as easy to implement. It only looks at pairs of vertices that are extreme in the same direction—this is allowed because of Observation 13.4—which makes it run in linear time. In the algorithm we use the notation \( \text{angle}(pq) \) to denote the angle that the vector \( \overrightarrow{pq} \) makes with the positive \( x \)-axis.

**Algorithm MINKOWSKI\text{SUM}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})**

*Input.* A convex polygon \( \mathcal{P} \) with vertices \( v_1, \ldots, v_n \), and a convex polygon \( \mathcal{R} \) with vertices \( w_1, \ldots, w_m \). The lists of vertices are assumed to be in counterclockwise order, with \( v_1 \) and \( w_1 \) being the vertices with smallest \( y \)-coordinate (and smallest \( x \)-coordinate in case of ties).

*Output.* The Minkowski sum \( \mathcal{P} \oplus \mathcal{R} \).

1. \( i \leftarrow 1; j \leftarrow 1 \)
2. \( v_{n+1} \leftarrow v_1; w_{m+1} \leftarrow w_1 \)
3. **repeat**
   4. Add \( v_i + w_j \) as a vertex to \( \mathcal{P} \oplus \mathcal{R} \).
   5. if \( \text{angle}(v_i v_{i+1}) < \text{angle}(w_j w_{j+1}) \)
      6. then \( i \leftarrow (i + 1) \)
   7. else if \( \text{angle}(v_i v_{i+1}) > \text{angle}(w_j w_{j+1}) \)
      8. then \( j \leftarrow (j + 1) \)
      9. else \( i \leftarrow (i + 1) \)
   10. \( j \leftarrow (j + 1) \)
4. **until** \( i = n + 1 \) and \( j = m + 1 \)

*MINKOWSKI\text{SUM} runs in linear time, because at each execution of the repeat loop either \( i \) or \( j \) is incremented and—as is not difficult to prove—they will not be incremented after reaching the values \( n + 1 \) and \( m + 1 \). The fact that the correct pairs of vertices are taken is similar to the proof of Theorem 13.5; one just has to observe that any vertex of the Minkowski sum is the sum of two original vertices that are extreme in a common direction, and argue that the angle test ensures that all extreme pairs are found.

We conclude with the following theorem:

**Theorem 13.10** The Minkowski sum of two convex polygons with \( n \) and \( m \) vertices, respectively, can be computed in \( O(n + m) \) time.

---

Section 13.3

MINKOWSKI SUMS
What happens if one or both of the polygons are not convex? This question is not so hard to answer if we realize that the following equality holds for any sets $S_1, S_2,$ and $S_3$:

$$S_1 \oplus (S_2 \cup S_3) = (S_1 \oplus S_2) \cup (S_1 \oplus S_3).$$

Now consider the Minkowski sum of a non-convex polygon $P$ and a convex polygon $R$, with $n$ and $m$ vertices respectively. What is the complexity of $P \oplus R$? We know from Chapter 3 that the polygon $P$ can be triangulated into $n - 2$ triangles $t_1, \ldots, t_{n-2}$, where $n$ is its number of vertices. From the equality above we can conclude that

$$P \oplus R = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-2} t_i \oplus R.$$

Since $t_i$ is a triangle and $R$ a convex polygon with $m$ vertices, we know that $t_i \oplus R$ is a convex polygon with at most $m + 3$ vertices. Moreover, the triangles have disjoint interiors, so the collection of Minkowski sums is a collection of pseudodiscs. Hence, the complexity of their union is linear in the sum of their complexities. This implies that the complexity of $P \oplus R$ is $O(nm)$.

This upper bound on the complexity of a non-convex and a convex polygon is tight in the worst case. To see this, consider a polygon $P$ with $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ spikes pointing upward, and a much smaller polygon $R$ that is the top half of a regular $(2m - 2)$-gon. The Minkowski sum of these polygons will also have $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ spikes, each of which has $m$ vertices at its top. Figure 13.8 illustrates the construction.

To bound the complexity of the Minkowski sum of two non-convex polygons $P$ and $R$, we triangulate both polygons. We get a collection of $n - 2$ triangles $t_i$, and a collection of $m - 2$ triangles $u_j$. The Minkowski sum of $P$ and $R$ is now the union of the Minkowski sums of the pairs $t_i, u_j$. Each sum $t_i \oplus u_j$ has constant complexity. Hence, $P \oplus R$ is the union of $(n - 2)(m - 2)$ constant-complexity polygons. This implies that the total complexity of $P \oplus R$ is $O(n^2m^2)$. Again, this bound is tight in the worst case: there are non-convex
polynomials whose Minkowski sum really has $\Theta(n^2m^2)$ complexity. Figure 13.9 illustrates this.

The following theorem summarizes the results on the complexity of Minkowski sums. For completeness the complexity in the case of two convex polygons is given as well.

**Theorem 13.11** Let $P$ and $R$ be polygons with $n$ and $m$ vertices, respectively. The complexity of the Minkowski sum $P \oplus R$ is bounded as follows:

(i)  it is $O(n + m)$ if both polygons are convex;
(ii) it is $O(nm)$ if one of the polygons is convex and one is non-convex;
(iii) it is $O(n^2m^2)$ if both polygons are non-convex.

These bounds are tight in the worst case.

Computing Minkowski sums of non-convex polygons is not very difficult: triangulate both polygons, compute the Minkowski sum of each pair of triangles, and take their union. This approach is basically the same as the approach described in the next section for computing the forbidden space of a translating robot, so we omit the details here.

### 13.4 Translational Motion Planning

It is time to return to the planar motion planning problem. Recall that our robot $R$ can only translate and that the obstacles are disjoint polygons. Early in the previous section we have shown that the $C$-obstacle corresponding to an obstacle $P_i$ is the Minkowski sum $P_i \oplus (-R)$. Moreover, we have seen that Minkowski sums of convex polygons are pseudodiscs. We use this to prove our first major result on the motion planning problem, which states that the complexity of the free space of a translating planar robot is linear.
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Theorem 13.12 Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a convex robot of constant complexity, translating among a set $S$ of non-intersecting polygonal obstacles with a total of $n$ edges. Then the complexity of the free configuration space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{free}}(\mathcal{R}, S)$ is $O(n)$.

Proof. First we triangulate each obstacle polygon. We get a set of $O(n)$ triangular, and hence convex, obstacles with disjoint interiors. The free configuration space is the complement of the union of the $C$-obstacles of these triangles. Because the robot has constant complexity, the $C$-obstacles have constant complexity, and according to Theorem 13.8 they form a set of pseudodiscs. Theorem 13.9 now implies that the union has linear complexity.

It remains to find an algorithm to construct the free space. Rather than computing the free space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{free}}$, we shall compute the forbidden space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{forb}}$; the free space is simply its complement.

Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ denote the triangles that we get when we triangulate the obstacles. We want to compute

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{forb}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} C P_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} P_i \oplus (-\mathcal{R}(0,0)).$$

In Section 13.3 we saw how to compute the individual Minkowski sums $CP_i$. To compute their union we use a simple divide-and-conquer approach.

Algorithm FORBIDDENSPACE($CP_1, \ldots, CP_n$)

Input. A collection of $C$-obstacles.

Output. The forbidden space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{forb}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} CP_i$.

1. if $n = 1$
2. then return $CP_1$
3. else $C_{\text{forb}}^1 \leftarrow$FORBIDDENSPACE($P_1, \ldots, P_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$)
4. $C_{\text{forb}}^2 \leftarrow$FORBIDDENSPACE($P_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}+1, \ldots, P_n$)
5. Compute $C_{\text{forb}} = C_{\text{forb}}^1 \cup C_{\text{forb}}^2$.
6. return $C_{\text{forb}}$

The heart of this algorithm is the subroutine to compute the union of two planar regions, which we need to perform the merge step (line 5). If we represent these regions by doubly-connected edge lists, this can be done by the overlay algorithm described in Chapter 2.

The following lemma summarizes the result.

Lemma 13.13 The free configuration space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{free}}$ of a convex robot of constant complexity translating among a set of polygons with $n$ edges in total can be computed in $O(n \log^2 n)$ time.

Proof. In Chapter 3 we saw that a polygon with $m$ vertices can be triangulated in $O(m \log m)$ time. (In fact, it can even be done in $O(m)$ time with a very complicated algorithm, as stated in the notes and comments of Chapter 3.) Hence, if $\mathcal{H}_i$ denotes the complexity of obstacle $P_i$, then triangulating all the
obstacles takes time proportional to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} m_i \log m_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{t} m_i \log n = n \log n.$$ 

Computing the C-obstacles of each of the resulting triangles takes linear time in total. It remains to bound the time that FORBIDDENSPACE needs to compute the union of the C-obstacles.

Using the results from Chapter 2, the merge step (line 5) can be done in $O((n_1 + n_2 + k) \log (n_1 + n_2))$ where $n_1$, $n_2$, and $k$ denote the complexity of $C^1_{\mathrm{forb}}$, $C^2_{\mathrm{forb}}$, and $C^1_{\mathrm{forb}} \cup C^2_{\mathrm{forb}}$. Theorem 13.12 states that the complexity of the free space—and, hence, of the forbidden space—is linear in the sum of the complexities of the obstacles. In our case this means that $n_1$, $n_2$, and $k$ are all $O(n)$, so the time for the merge step is $O(n \log n)$. We get the following recurrence for $T(n)$, the time the algorithm needs when applied to a set of $n$ constant-complexity C-obstacles:

$$T(n) = T(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor) + T(\lceil n/2 \rceil) + O(n \log n).$$

The solution of this recurrence is $O(n \log^2 n)$.

The result of this theorem is not the best possible—see the notes and comments of this chapter.

Now that we have computed the free space, we can continue in exactly the same way as in Section 13.2: we compute a trapezoidal map of the free space, together with a roadmap. Given a start and a goal placement of the robot $R$, we find a path as follows. First, we map the start and goal placement to points in the configuration space. Then we compute a path between these two points through the free space using the trapezoidal map and the road map, as described in Section 13.2. Finally, we map the path back to a path for $R$ in the workspace.

The next theorem summarizes the result of our efforts.

**Theorem 13.14** Let $R$ be a convex robot of constant complexity translating among a set $S$ of disjoint polygonal obstacles with $n$ edges in total. We can preprocess $S$ in $O(n \log^2 n)$ expected time, such that between any start and goal position a collision-free path for $R$, if it exists, can be computed in $O(n)$ time.

### 13.5* Motion Planning with Rotations

In the previous sections the robot was only allowed to translate. When the robot is circular this does not limit its possible motion. On the other hand, when it is long and skinny, translational motion is often not enough: it may have to change its orientation to be able to pass through a narrow passage or to go around a corner. In this section we sketch a method to plan motion for robots that can rotate as well as translate.
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Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a convex polygonal robot that can translate and rotate in a planar work space that contains a set $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_t$ of disjoint polygonal obstacles. The robot $\mathcal{R}$ has three degrees of freedom: two translational and one rotational degree of freedom. Hence, we can specify a placement for $\mathcal{R}$ by three parameters: the $x$- and $y$-coordinate of a reference point of $\mathcal{R}$, and an angle $\phi$ that specifies its orientation. As in Section 13.1, we use $\mathcal{R}(x,y,\phi)$ to denote the robot placed with its reference point at $(x,y)$ and rotated over an angle $\phi$.

The configuration space that we get is the 3-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0:360)$, with a topology where points $(x,y,0)$ and $(x,y,360)$ are identified. Recall that $\mathcal{CP}_i$, the $\mathcal{C}$-obstacle of an obstacle $\mathcal{P}_i$, is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{CP}_i := \{(x,y,\phi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0:360) : \mathcal{R}(x,y,\phi) \cap \mathcal{P}_i \neq \emptyset\}.$$

What do these $\mathcal{C}$-obstacles look like? This question is difficult to answer directly, but we can get an idea by looking at cross-sections with planes of constant $\phi$. In such a plane the rotation angle is fixed, so we are dealing with a purely translational problem. Hence, we know the shape of the cross-section: it is a Minkowski sum. More precisely, the cross-section of $\mathcal{CP}_i$ with the plane $h : \phi = \phi_0$ is equal to $\mathcal{P}_i \oplus \mathcal{R}(0,0,\phi_0)$. (More precisely, it is a copy of the work space configuration space)

Minkowski sum placed at height $\phi_0$.) Now imagine sweeping a horizontal plane upwards through configuration space, starting at $\phi = 0$ and ending at $\phi = 360$. At any time during the sweep the cross-section of the plane with $\mathcal{CP}_i$ is a Minkowski sum. The shape of the Minkowski sum changes continuously: at $\phi = \phi_0$ the cross-section is $\mathcal{P}_i \oplus \mathcal{R}(0,0,\phi_0)$, and at $\phi = \phi_0 + \varepsilon$ the cross-section is $\mathcal{P}_i \oplus \mathcal{R}(0,0,\phi_0 + \varepsilon)$. This means that $\mathcal{CP}_i$ looks like a twisted pillar, as in Figure 13.10. The edges and facets of this twisted pillar, except for the top facet and bottom facet, are curved.

So we know more or less what $\mathcal{C}$-obstacles look like. The free space is the complement of the union of these $\mathcal{C}$-obstacles. Due to the nasty shape of the $\mathcal{C}$-obstacles, the free space is rather complicated: its boundary is no longer polygonal, but curved. Moreover, the combinatorial complexity of the free
space can be quadratic for a convex robot, and even cubic for a non-convex robot. Nevertheless, we can solve the motion planning problem using the same approach we took before: compute a decomposition of the free space into simple cells, and construct a road map to guide the motions between neighboring cells. Given a start and goal placement of the robot we then find a path as follows. We map these placements to points in configuration space, find the cells that contain the points, and construct a path consisting of three parts: a path from the start position to the node of the road map in the center of the start cell, a path along the road map to the node in the center of the goal cell, and a path inside the goal cell to the final destination. It remains to map the path in configuration space back to a motion in the work space.

Because of the complex shape of the $C$-obstacles, it is difficult to compute a suitable cell decomposition, especially when it comes to an actual implementation. Therefore we shall describe a different, simpler approach. As we shall see, however, this approach has its drawbacks as well. Our approach is based on the same observation we used to study the shape of the $C$-obstacles, namely that the motion planning problem reduces to a purely translational problem if we restrict the attention to a horizontal cross-section of the configuration space. We will call such a cross-section a slice. The idea is to compute a finite number of slices. A path for the robot now consists of two types of motion: motions within a slice—these are purely translational—and motions from one slice to the next or previous one—these will be purely rotational.

Let’s formalize this. Let $z$ denote the number of slices we take. For every integer $i$ with $0 \leq i \leq z - 1$, let $\phi_i = i \times (360/z)$. We compute a slice of the free space for each $\phi_i$. Since within the slice we are dealing with a purely translational problem for the robot $R(0,0,\phi_i)$, we can compute the slice using the methods of the previous section. This will give us the trapezoidal map $T_i$ of the free space within the slice. For each $T_i$ we compute a road map $G_i$. These road maps are used to plan the motions within a slice, as in Section 13.2.

It remains to connect consecutive slices. More precisely, we connect every pair of roadmaps $G_i$, $G_{i+1}$ to obtain a roadmap $G_{\text{road}}$ of the entire configuration space. This is done as follows. We take the trapezoidal maps of each pair of consecutive slices, and compute their overlay with the algorithm of Chapter 2. (Strictly speaking, we should say that we compute the overlay of the projections of $T_i$ and $T_{i+1}$ onto the plane $h : \phi = 0$.) This tells us all the pairs $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$ with $\Delta_1 \in T_i$ and $\Delta_2 \in T_{i+1}$ such that $\Delta_1$ intersects $\Delta_2$. Let $(x,y,0)$ be a point in $\Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2$. We then add an extra node to $G_{\text{road}}$ at $(x,y,\phi_i)$ and at $(x,y,\phi_{i+1})$, which we connect by an arc. Moving from one slice to the other along this arc corresponds to a rotation from $\phi_i$ to $\phi_{i+1}$, or back. Furthermore, the node at $(x,y,\phi_i)$ is connected to the node at the center of $\Delta_1$, and the node at $(x,y,\phi_{i+1})$ is connected to the node at the center of $\Delta_2$. These connections stay within a slice, so they correspond to purely translational motions. We connect $G_{i-1}$ and $G_0$ in the same way. Note that paths in the graph $G_{\text{road}}$ correspond to paths of the robot that are composed of purely translational motion (when we move along an arc connecting nodes in the same slice) and purely rotational motion (when we move along an arc connecting nodes in different slices).
Once we have constructed this road map, we can use it to plan a motion for \( R \) from any start placement \( R(x_{\text{start}}, y_{\text{start}}, \phi_{\text{start}}) \) to any goal placement \( R(x_{\text{goal}}, y_{\text{goal}}, \phi_{\text{goal}}) \). To do this, we first determine the slices closest to the start and goal placement by rounding the orientations \( \phi_{\text{start}} \) and \( \phi_{\text{goal}} \) to the nearest orientation \( \phi_i \) for which we constructed a slice. Within those slices we determine the trapezoids \( \Delta_{\text{start}} \) and \( \Delta_{\text{goal}} \) containing the start and goal position. If one of these trapezoids does not exist because the start or goal position lies in the forbidden space within the slice, then we report that we cannot compute a path. Otherwise, let \( v_{\text{start}} \) and \( v_{\text{goal}} \) be the nodes of the road map that have been placed in their center. We try to find a path in \( G_{\text{road}} \) from \( v_{\text{start}} \) to \( v_{\text{goal}} \) using breadth-first search. If there is no path in the graph, we report that we cannot compute a motion. Otherwise we report a motion consisting of five parts: a purely rotational motion from the start position to the nearest slice, a purely translational motion within that slice to the node \( v_{\text{start}} \), a motion that corresponds to the path from \( v_{\text{start}} \) to \( v_{\text{goal}} \) in \( G_{\text{road}} \), a purely translational motion from \( v_{\text{goal}} \) to the final position within that slice (which is the slice nearest to the goal position), and finally a purely rotational motion to the real goal position.

This method is a generalization of the method we used for translating motions, but \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) has a major problem: it is not always correct. Sometimes it may erroneously report that a path does not exist. For instance, the start position can be in the free space, whereas the start position within the nearest slice is not. In this case we report that there is no path, which need not be true. Even worse is that the paths we report need not be collision-free. The translational motions within a slice are okay, because we solved the problem within a slice exactly, but the rotational motions from one slice to the next may cause problems: the placements within the two slices are collision-free, but halfway the robot could collide with an obstacle. Both problems are less likely to occur when we increase the number of slices, but we can never be certain of the correctness of the result. This is especially bothersome for the second problem: we definitely don’t want our possibly very expensive robot to have a collision.

\[ R \]
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\( Figure 13.11 \)

Enlarging the robot

Therefore we use the following trick. We make the robot slightly larger, and use the method described above on the enlarged robot \( R' \). This is done in such a way that although \( R' \) can collide during rotations, the original robot \( R \) cannot. To achieve this, the robot is enlarged as follows. Rotate \( R \) clockwise and counter-clockwise over an angle of \( (180/z)^\circ \). During this rotation \( R \) sweeps a part of the plane. We use for the enlarged robot \( R' \) a convex polygon that contains the sweep area—see Figure 13.11. We now compute the
trapezoidal maps and the road map for \( R' \) instead of \( R \). It is not difficult to prove that \( R \) cannot collide with an obstacle during a purely rotational motion between two adjacent slices, even though \( R' \) can. By enlarging the robot we have introduced another way to incorrectly decide that there is no path. Again, this becomes less likely when the number of slices increases. So with a large number of slices, the method probably performs reasonably well in practical situations.

### 13.6 Notes and Comments

The motion planning problem has received a lot of attention over the years, both from people working in computational geometry and from people working in robotics, and this chapter only scratches the surface of all the research. A much more extensive treatment of the problem is given by Latombe [207]. Nevertheless, the concepts we have introduced—configuration space, decomposition of the free space, road maps that transform the geometric problem into a graph searching problem—underly the majority of approaches that have been proposed.

These concepts date back to the work of Lozano-Pérez [221, 222, 223]. An important difference between his method and the method of this chapter is that he used an approximate decomposition of the free space. The approach of Section 13.2, which uses an exact decomposition of the free space of a planar translating robot into trapezoids, is based on more recent work by Kedem et al. [195, 196]. An improved algorithm, which runs in \( O(n \log n) \) time, was given by Bhattacharya and Zorbas [48].

A very general method that is based on finding an exact cell decomposition of the free space was given by Schwartz and Sharir [304]. It is based on a decomposition method of Collins [114]. Unfortunately, this method takes time doubly exponential in the dimension of the configuration space. This can be improved using a decomposition method of Chazelle et al. [81].

In this chapter we have seen that the cell decomposition approach leads to an \( O(n \log^2 n) \) algorithm when applied to a convex robot translating in the plane. The bottleneck in the algorithm was the computation of the union of a collection of Minkowski sums. Using a randomized incremental algorithm, instead of a divide-and-conquer algorithm, this step can be done in \( O(n \log n) \) time [42, 246].

The translational motion planning problem in 3-dimensional space can be solved in \( O(n^2 \log^3 n) \) time [10].

The approach we sketched for robots that can translate and rotate is approximate: it isn’t guaranteed to find a path if it exists. It is possible to find an exact solution by computing an exact cell decomposition of the free space in \( O(n^3) \) time [21]. For a convex robot, the running time can be reduced to \( O(n^2 \log^3 n) \) [197].

The free space of a robot may consist of a number of disconnected components. Of course, the motions of the robot are confined to the component
where it starts; to go to another component it would have to pass through the
forbidden space. Hence, it is sufficient to compute only a single cell in the free
space, instead of the entire free space. Usually the worst-case complexity of
a single cell is one order of magnitude lower than the complexity of the entire
free space. This can be used to speed up the asymptotic running time of the
motion planning algorithms. The book by Agarwal and Sharir [313] and the
thesis by Halperin [173] discuss single cells and their connection to motion
planning at length.

The theoretical complexity of the motion planning is exponential in the
number of degrees of freedom of the robot, which makes the problem appear
intractable for high DOF robots. Under some mild restrictions on the shape
of the robot and the obstacles—which are likely to be satisfied in practical
situations—one can show that the complexity of the free space is only lin-
er [318, 319].

Cell decomposition methods are not the only exact methods for motion plan-
ing. Another approach is the so-called retraction method. Here a road map is
constructed directly, without decomposing the free space. Furthermore, a re-
traction function is defined, which maps any point in the free space to a point on
the road map. Once this has been done, paths can be found by retracting both
start and goal to the road map and next following a path along the road map.
Different types of road maps and retraction functions have been proposed. A
nice road map is the Voronoi diagram, because it stays as far away from the
obstacles as possible. If the robot is a disc, then we can use the normal Voronoi
diagram; otherwise one has to use a different distance function in the defini-
tion of the Voronoi diagram, which depends on the shape of the robot. Still,
such a diagram can often be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time [220, 260], leading
to another $O(n \log n)$ time algorithm for translational motion planning. A very
general road map method has been proposed by Canny [60]. It can solve almost
any motion planning problem in time $O(n^d \log n)$, where $d$ is the dimension
of the configuration space, that is, the number of degrees of freedom of the robot.
Unfortunately, the method is very complicated, and it has the disadvantage that
most of the time the robot moves in contact with an obstacle. This is often not
the preferred type of motion.

In this chapter we have concentrated mainly on exact motion planning. There
are also a number of heuristic approaches.

For instance, one can use approximate cell decompositions [53, 221, 222,
344] instead of exact ones. These are often based on quad trees.

Another heuristic is the potential field method [27, 199, 327]. Here one
defines a potential field on the configuration space by making the goal position
attract the robot and making the obstacles repel it. The robot then moves in
the direction dictated by the potential field. The problem with this approach
is that the robot can get stuck in local minima of the potential field. Various
techniques have been proposed to escape the minima.

Another heuristic which has recently become popular is the probabilistic
road map method [274, 194]. It computes a number of random placements for
the robot, which are connected in some way to form a road map of the free space. The road map can then be used to plan paths between any given start and goal placement.

Minkowski sums not only play an important role in motion planning, but also in other problems. An example is the problem of placing one polygon inside another [97]; this can be useful if one wants to cut out some shape from a piece of fabric. For some basic results on properties of Minkowski sums and their computation we refer to [31, 165].

In this chapter we concentrated on finding some path for the robot, but we didn’t try to find a short path. This is the topic of Chapter 15.

Finally, we note that we allowed paths where the robot touches an obstacle. Such paths are sometimes called “semi-free” [207, 303]. Paths that do not touch any obstacle are then called “free”. It is useful to be aware of these terms when studying the motion planning literature.

13.7 Exercises

13.1 Let $R$ be a robotic arm with a fixed base and seven links. The last joint of $R$ is a prismatic joint, the other ones are revolute joints. Give a set of parameters that determines a placement of $R$. What is the dimension of the configuration space resulting from your choice of parameters?

13.2 In the road map $G_{\text{road}}$ that was constructed on the trapezoidal decomposition of the free space we added a node in the center of each trapezoid and on each vertical wall. It is possible to avoid the nodes in the center of each trapezoid. Show how the graph can be changed such that only nodes on the vertical walls are required. (Avoid an increase in the number of edges in the graph.) Explain how to adapt the query algorithm.

13.3 Prove that the shape of $CP_i$ is independent of the choice of the reference point in the robot $R$.

13.4 What does the Minkowski sum of two circles with radius $r_1$ and $r_2$ look like?

13.5 Let $P_1$ and $P_2$ be two convex polygons. Let $S_1$ be the collection of vertices of $P_1$ and $S_2$ be the collection of vertices of $P_2$. Prove that

$$P_1 \oplus P_2 = \text{ConvexHull}(S_1 \oplus S_2).$$

13.6 Prove Observation 13.4.

13.7 In Theorem 13.9 we gave an $O(n)$ bound on the complexity of the union of a set of polygonal pseudodiscs with $n$ vertices in total. We are interested in the precise bound.
a. Assume that the union boundary contains $m$ original vertices of the polygons. Show that the complexity of the union boundary is bounded by $2n - m$. Use this to prove an upper bound of $2n - 3$.
b. Prove a lower bound of $2n - 6$ by constructing an example that has this complexity.